


Human Exploration Extensibility from Moon to Mars



Hoppy Price
Mars Exploration Program Office
NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory
California Institute of Technology


Presentation to JPL
July 26, 2019



NASA's Moon to Mars Program




- NASA has been given a directive to land U.S. astronauts on the Moon before the end of 2024. NASA's program to realize this is called Artemis.
- Congress has given NASA a goal to launch U.S. astronauts to Mars before the end of 2033. They required NASA to report back on the feasibility.
 - The Science and Technology Policy Institute's (STPI's) independent analysis produced the assessment that this is not credible using NASA's current reference Mars architecture
 - Life support systems, 500 kWe class SEP, zero-boil-off (ZBO) propellants, and Mars surface LOX production were cited as high risk technologies
 - Refueling and reusability were cited as medium risks

Proposed NASA Lunar Architecture Elements




NASA Mars Architecture Concept

- Lunar orbiting Gateway would be used as an assembly point
- Reusable SEP/chemical Deep Space Transport (DST) would transfer crews between the Gateway and high Mars orbit
- Landers would be separately delivered to high Mars orbit by SEP tugs
- Crews would transfer from DST to lander in high Mars orbit



Feed Forward to NASA Mars Architecture Concept



- Lunar mission elements could be prototypes and pathfinders for Mars mission elements in the reference NASA Mars architecture



“Achieving Mars” Community Architectures

developed at December 2017 workshop



- Group 1 – sortie class missions
 - like Apollo plus, but evolvable
- Group 2 – research station
 - like Antarctic field camp
- Group 3 – permanent presence
 - like the South Pole Station



Explore Mars AM V Group 1 Concept

- Would utilize near-term technology systems. Avoids risks cited in the STPI report*:
 - 500 kWe SEP
 - Cryogenic propellants
 - Refueling and reusability
 - ISRU propellant production
- Would minimize the number of new vehicle developments
- Would minimize development and mission risk with less complex systems
- Would be evolvable to reusable systems and ISRU
- Could possibly support a short-stay landing in 2033 (~570 day total mission duration)


* Linck, E. et al, "Evaluation of a Human Mission to Mars by 2033", Science & Technology Policy Institute, IDA D-10510, Feb. 2019



High heritage Descent/Ascent Vehicle

Lunar Feed Forward to AM V Group 1 Architecture

- Lunar mission elements could be prototypes and pathfinders for Mars mission elements in the AM V Group 1 architecture




High Heritage Crew Lander Concept


Could support crew of 4 for 2 weeks by itself, or longer with other surface assets




Launch



Mars 2020 heatshield and backshell (4.5 m)




Landed Configuration




MAV Ascent

Entry, Descent, and Landing (EDL) Concept for Crewed Mars Lander





EDL Trajectory for Blunt-Body Lander Concept






Selected EDL Monte Carlo Simulation Results

- ~20 t of propellant is used
- Crew experiences ~6.5 g for <30 s
- Backshell separation and SRP are at ~Mach 3.8 and 4 kPa




EntryMass=75000kg,D=10m EFPA=-14.853deg,CL Bank L/D=0.24

- LDSD derived SIAD could save ~4 t of propellant
- Could be an option for cargo vehicles



Crew of 4; 950 day round trip

Mars



2033 Short vs. Long Duration Mission

- Long-duration conjunction-class and short-duration opposition-class mission architectures are options for the 2033 opportunity
 - Short-duration mission is 570 days vs. 950 days, but requires much larger Mars departure ΔV
 - Greater mass constraints on Deep Space Hab and chemical stages
 - Both missions share type I transfer to Mars in April 2033
 - Long-duration spends 550 days at Mars, whereas short-duration spends 31 days at Mars and performs a Venus fly-by on the return leg (at a cost of 3.3 vs. 1.1 km/s for TEI)


	Long Duration	Short Duration	
Launch C3	9.07	9.07	km ² /s ²
Mars VHP	3.32	3.32	km/s
Departure VHP	2.96	5.91	km/s
Earth VHP	3.03	4.59	km/s
E Launch Date	4/17/2033	4/17/2033	
M Arrival Date	11/2/2033	11/2/2033	
M Launch Date	5/7/2035	12/3/2033	
E Arrival Date	11/23/2035	11/8/2034	
Mission Duration	950	570	days
Mars Stay	551	31	days
Outbound Leg	199	199	days
Return Leg	200	340	days

Pre-decisional. For discussion purposes only.

2033 Short-Duration Mars Sortie Mission Concept

Crew of 4; 570 day round trip

Mars



Mars Short Surface Stay Mission


First Crew on Mars

- Would be the pathfinder for a continuing series of long stay missions to Mars
- Would include a separate sky crane cargo lander with unpressurized rover and









science equipment that would provide for crew surface transportation and could also be teleoperated from orbit.

- Would be significantly greater in scope than Apollo 17




Six Vehicles to Enable Short Duration Mission to Mars

Vehicles	# Vehicles for Mission	
Orion 	1	In development
SLS 	6	In development
SEP Tug ~125 kWe 	2	Would have heritage to 50 kWe Gateway Power and Propulsion Element
Deep Space Habitat 	1	Would have heritage to smaller Gateway Habitat
In-Space Chemical Propulsion Stage 	5	Would have heritage to Lunar Transfer Vehicle Element
Mars Lander 	1	MAV crew cabin would have heritage to Lunar Ascent Element

Cargo and Surface Elements Extensibility


- Lunar cargo and surface elements could have extensibility to follow-on long surface stay Mars missions
 - Small Pressurized Rover (SPR)
 - Cargo mobility systems
 - Cargo container systems
 - Surface power systems (solar, batteries, Kilopower, Stirling RTGs)
 - Surface habitat

Cargo and logistics





Entry Configurations

Surface habitat




Landed Configurations



for 2033 Short Stay Mars Landing and Follow-On Long Stay Landings



SLS Block 2 and Commercial Launch Concepts for Notional 2033 Mission




Launches #3 and #6 have limited launch periods. The other launches have flexible launch dates.

Maximizing Feed Forward to Mars


- Lunar elements could be designed to maximize feed forward to the Mars architecture elements to:
 - Prove out needed technologies, components, system designs, mission operations, and surface operations
 - Develop vehicle assembly and maneuvering capability at Gateway
 - Retire risk for the Mars missions
 - Reduce cost and schedule for developing Mars vehicles
- The initial Mars architecture vehicles could be designed to maximize heritage from the Lunar elements
 - Later missions to Mars would build on the higher heritage initial systems to on-ramp new technologies and capabilities
- An early crewed Moon landing in 2024 could serve to advance exploration vehicle development and could possibly lead to a Mars landing as early as 2033, if sufficient funding was available

Supplementary Material

Concept for Descent/Ascent Vehicle (DAV) Transit to High Mars Orbit




Crewed Mars Descent/Ascent Vehicle Concept



Lander and MAV propellants in this example are MMH and MON-15.


Concept for MAV Ascent, Transfer to Deep Space Hab, and Preparation for Trans-Earth Injection





Contingency and Abort Capabilities for 2033

- The crew transit vehicle stack could abort back to Earth for a limited time after TMI, utilizing the MOI and TEI stages
- The crew transit vehicle stack could be on a free return trajectory to abort back to Earth if MOI was in jeopardy
- Orion could function as a temporary lifeboat in the event of other vehicle anomalies
- Orion could provide emergency EVA capability
- Orion and the MOI/TEI stages could each perform attitude control and TCMs for the crew transit vehicle stack in the event of a failure of one of them
- If the MAV boost stage was not functional, then the Mars landing would be cancelled
- Fully-fueled MAV concept would have abort-to-orbit capability during EDL and after landing
- If one of the two TEI stages was not usable, then the crew could wait an extra year in Mars orbit and return with just one stage on a long-duration mission. DSH would carry consumables to cover that contingency.

Going ISRU: Concept for Converting MAV from MMH/MON-15 to LOX/CH₄ or LOX/MMH

MMH/MON-15  LOX/CH₄ or LOX/MMH




Note: Keep descent propulsion the same – MMH/MON-15

Potential Artificial Gravity Experiments During Transit to Mars

Artificial gravity potential:

2.5 RPM \approx 0.1 g

4.7 RPM \approx 0.38 g (Mars grav.)



- A spin rate of 2.5 to 5 RPM could create a useful experimental Artificial Gravity (AG) environment in Orion
- Boeing tests have suggested that most people could adapt to 5 rpm
- Orion could be reconfigured in-flight to move seats and support exercise equipment, food preparation, and other activities in the AG zone
- Vehicle stack would need to have spin axis toward sun and be on Low Gain Antenna communication
 - Would rotate about axis of greatest inertia with solar arrays facing sun
- This would be a capability-driven approach designed to have minimal impact on vehicle design and cost
 - Would require strengthening of solar arrays if providing AG $>\sim$ 0.1 g